



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,434	02/28/2002	William L. Tonar	GEN-001323C3	4510
30981	7590	06/20/2003	EXAMINER	
FACTOR & PARTNERS, PLC 305 HOOVER BOULEVARD SUITE 300 HOLLAND, MI 49423			TUCKER, PHILIP C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1712	5	

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

<p style="text-align: right; margin-top: -20px;"><i>G</i></p>	Application No. <b>10/085434</b>	Applicant(s) <b>TONAR</b>	 
Examiner <b>P. TUCKER</b>	Group Art Unit <b>1712</b>		

*—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—*

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 3 - 47 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 3 - 47 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

### Application Papers

- The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received  
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

### Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1712

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 19 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 612826. EP teaches an electrochromic device comprising an electrochromic compound, a solvent, and a crosslinked polymer as in the present invention (see claims). EP teaches that partial polymerization may take place prior to a full cure in the crosslinking of the monomer solution (page 17, lines 32-41). The present invention is thus anticipated by EP.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1712

4. Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45 and 47 - 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 612826.

EP teaches an electrochromic device comprising an electrochromic compound, a solvent, and a crosslinked polymer as in the present invention (see claims). EP teaches that partial polymerization may take place prior to a full cure in the crosslinking of the monomer solution (page 17, lines 32-41). EP differs from the present invention in that polymers with a range of from 1000 to 5000 daltons are not specifically disclosed. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make polymers with at least a weight of 1000-5000 daltons, since such are so low as to be envisaged, or surpassed in any polymerization reaction.

#### ***Double Patenting***

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1712

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 3-47 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-101 of U.S. Patent No. 5,928,572. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although the present claims differ in teaching a molecular weight and specific structure of the device, the use of polymers with as low a molecular weight as 1000-5000 daltons would be instantly envisaged by one of ordinary skill in the art, since such weights are so low, and the device structures are typical of an electrochromic device having a window.

7. Claims 3-47 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,248,263. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although the present claims differ in teaching a molecular weight, the use of polymers with at

Art Unit: 1712

least as low a molecular weight as 1000-5000 daltons would be instantly envisaged by one of ordinary skill in the art, since such weights are so low.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tucker whose telephone number is (703) 308-0529. The examiner's normal working hours are 7:30am-4:00pm, Monday-Friday. If necessary SPE Robert Dawson may be contacted at 703-308-2340. For inquiries of a general nature call the receptionist at 703-308-0651. The group FAX no. is 703-872-9310. The **after final** fax no. Is 703-872-9311.

PCT-2824  
June 13, 2003

  
**PHILIP C. TUCKER**  
**ART UNIT 1712**